

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This Executive Summary section is provided in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15123. As stated in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(a), “[a]n EIR shall contain a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences. The language of the summary should be as clear and simple as reasonably practical.” State CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b) states, “[t]he summary shall identify: (1) each significant effect with proposed mitigation measures and alternatives that would reduce or avoid that effect; (2) areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public; and (3) issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.” Accordingly, this summary includes a brief synopsis of the proposed project and project alternatives, environmental impacts and mitigation, areas of known controversy, and issues to be resolved during environmental review. Table 2-1 (at the end of this section) presents the summary of potential environmental impacts, their level of significance without mitigation measures, the recommended mitigation measures, and the levels of significance following the implementation of mitigation measures.

2.2 PROJECT COMPONENTS

The Rocklin Crossings project (proposed project) includes the construction of a regional shopping center on approximately 55.1 acres at the southeast corner of Interstate-80 and Sierra College Boulevard. The property is proposed to be subdivided into 18 parcels. A variety of retail uses are proposed for the center, including major tenants (expected to be a Wal-Mart Supercenter and a Home Depot), smaller retail tenants and restaurants. Other traveler-serving uses could also be developed within the project site. Preliminary plans call for approximately 21 buildings totaling a maximum of 543,500 square feet with approximately 2,463 parking stalls.

A detailed description of the project components is included in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this document.

2.3 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15382, a significant effect on the environment is defined as “a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance”. Chapter 4 of this Draft EIR describes in detail the significant environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project. Chapter 6 provides a discussion of cumulative and growth-inducing impacts. As identified in more detail in Table 2-1, the proposed project could result in significant impacts to the following resource areas:

- ▶ Traffic and Circulation
- ▶ Air Quality
- ▶ Noise
- ▶ Public Services and Utilities
- ▶ Aesthetics
- ▶ Public Health and Hazards
- ▶ Hydrology and Water Quality
- ▶ Biological Resources
- ▶ Cultural Resources
- ▶ Global Climate Change

2.4 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Detailed mitigation measures have been identified throughout Chapters 4 and 6 of this report that are intended to mitigate project effects to the extent feasible. All of these mitigation measures are identified in Table 2-1. After implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, most of the adverse effects associated with the proposed project would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. However, some impacts would remain significant and unavoidable following the implementation of identified mitigation measures. These impacts include the following:

2.4.1 CONTRIBUTION TO LONG-TERM OPERATIONAL (REGIONAL) CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANTS

Based on the modeling conducted, project operations would result in worst-case maximum unmitigated daily emissions of approximately 196 lb/day of ROG, 311 lb/day of NO_x, 281 lb/day of PM₁₀, and 2,196 lb/day of CO. Daily unmitigated operational emissions would exceed PCAPCD's significance thresholds of 82 lb/day for ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀, or 550 lb/day for CO during both the winter and summer periods. Due to the large size of the project and large number of vehicle trips generated, it is not anticipated that implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce emissions to below the applicable thresholds; however, these measures would likely substantially reduce the level of emissions. In addition, because of existing nonattainment conditions of the project area for ozone and PM₁₀, project implementation could still contribute substantially to an existing or projected violation of ambient air quality standards following implementation of the identified mitigation measures. As a result, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. This conclusion is consistent with the 1991 City of Rocklin General Plan EIR, which concluded that mobile-source emissions associated with General Plan buildout would result in significant and unavoidable regional air quality impacts.

2.4.2 CHANGES IN THE SITE'S VISUAL RESOURCES

The conversion of the project site to urban uses was anticipated in the Environmental Impact Report prepared for the 1991 City of Rocklin General Plan (City of Rocklin 1991). The General Plan EIR stated that the conversion of open grasslands and hill areas to mixed urban development with implementation of the General Plan land uses would result in a significant and unavoidable visual impact. The project would extend this ongoing visual conversion of the Interstate 80 corridor. Based on the visual resource impact conclusions of the General Plan EIR, the visual prominence of the site from Interstate 80 and Sierra College Boulevard, and the potential for the change in the project's visual resources to be considered adverse by motorists and occupants of adjacent land uses, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

2.4.3 SHORT-TERM LOSS OF NATIVE OAK AND HERITAGE TREES

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the removal of native oak trees on the site including two heritage trees. Mitigation measures have been included in this document that require the replacement of all oak trees removed with site development at a minimum 2:1 ratio. Because the removed trees would not be immediately replaced with an mature oak tree, the short-term loss of native oak trees is considered a significant and unavoidable impact. However, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level in the long-term once replanted trees become established and mature.

2.4.4 CUMULATIVE CONTRIBUTION TO LONG-TERM OPERATIONAL (REGIONAL) CRITERIA AIR POLLUTANTS

All new development within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin that results in an increase in air pollutant emissions above those assumed in regional air plans contributes to cumulative air quality impacts. The increase is considered significant if the project requires a change in the existing land use designation (e.g., plan amendment,

rezone) and associated emissions (i.e., ROG and NO_x) are greater than buildout of the site under the existing approved land use designations. The proposed project would require the amendment of the City's existing General Plan land use designations on approximately 1.23 acres of the project site from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Retail Commercial (RC). Due to the relatively small area of the change in land use, it would not substantially conflict with the existing land uses assumed for the site.

However, based on the modeling conducted, project operations would result in worst-case maximum unmitigated daily emissions of approximately 196 lb/day of ROG, 311 lb/day of NO_x, 281 lb/day of PM₁₀, and 2,196 lb/day of CO. Daily unmitigated operational emissions would exceed PCAPCD's significance thresholds of 82 lb/day for ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀, or 550 lb/day for CO during both the winter and summer periods. These threshold exceedances would represent a substantial contribution of pollutants to the regional air basin that would not be reduced below the significance thresholds with implementation of identified mitigation measures. Therefore, the project's contribution to this cumulative impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

2.4.5 CUMULATIVE CHANGES IN LOCAL VIEWSHED

Implementation of the proposed project would substantially alter the visual character of the project site through the conversion of relatively undeveloped land to developed urban uses, resulting in a significant aesthetic impact related to the degradation of visual character. The EIR for the City of Rocklin General Plan concluded that development in accordance with the General Plan would substantially alter viewsheds and vistas in the region as open grasslands and hill areas are replaced in part by mixed urban development and as new sources of light and glare are generated in the region. Based on these anticipated changes in the regional visual resources, the General Plan EIR concluded that this impact would be significant and unavoidable. The project would considerably contribute to this cumulative significant and unavoidable regional change in visual resources.

2.4.6 CUMULATIVE LOSS OF BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The proposed project would result in significant impacts related to the loss of wetlands, the loss of native oaks and heritage trees, the loss of valley elderberry longhorn beetle habitat, the disturbance of raptors and migratory birds, and degradation of fish habitat. As identified in the EIR for the City of Rocklin General Plan, the impacts on biological resources due to cumulative development within western Placer County would be significant and unavoidable. The General Plan EIR concluded that implementation of General Plan policies, the existing tree protection ordinances, and ongoing wetlands preservation practices, would not be adequate to reduce the loss of vegetation and wildlife habitat associated with cumulative development. The project would considerably contribute to this cumulative significant and unavoidable regional loss of biological resources.

2.5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, as amended, mandates that all EIRs include a comparative evaluation of the proposed project with alternatives to the project that are capable of attaining most of the project's basic objectives, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. CEQA requires an evaluation of a "range of reasonable" alternatives, including the "no project" alternative. Chapter 7, Alternatives, of this Draft EIR provides an analysis of the comparative impacts anticipated from six alternatives to the proposed project: 1) the No-Project Alternative, which assumes the development of the site consistent with its current land use and zoning designations; 2) the Reduced Size Alternative, which would reduce the total square footage of commercial space by approximately 50% and would reduce the development footprint to approximately 30 acres; 3) the Building Realignment Alternative, which includes a relocation of large tenants to directly adjacent to Interstate 80 in order to minimize the exposure of existing and future residents to delivery truck noise and air pollutant emissions; and 4) three offsite alternatives within the City of Rocklin. One additional offsite alternative was also considered but was rejected from further analysis because it was determined to be infeasible.

2.6 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY, ISSUES RAISED, AND AREAS RESOLVED IN THE EIR

Section 15123 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of a Draft EIR to identify areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. The following provides a brief summary of the issues raised by agencies and the public in comment letters received on the Notice of Preparation. The comment letters received on the Notice of Preparation are included in Appendix A of this document.

- ▶ Concern about overnight camping in campers/trailers at Wal-Mart stores;
- ▶ Increased traffic congestion on regional roadways;
- ▶ Impacts on regional air quality;
- ▶ Loss of sensitive biological resources including oak trees;
- ▶ Increased congestion on Interstate 80 and Highway 65, and its effects on law enforcement;
- ▶ Citizen involvement in land use decision making;
- ▶ Loss of Rocklin's rural character;
- ▶ Need for the proposed project;
- ▶ Project's effects on roads, schools, fire protection and recreation;
- ▶ Project's effects on Secret Ravine Creek; and
- ▶ Sewer connection requirements of the proposed project.

All of the substantive environmental issues raised in the Notice of Preparation comment letters have been addressed in this Draft EIR.

2.7 CITY APPROVAL PROCESS

The City, in its review of the proposed project, will consider the entire environmental assessment contained in this Draft EIR. Upon completion of the environmental review process, the City will have the option to certify that the Final EIR: (1) has been completed in compliance with CEQA; (2) was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency (i.e., the Planning Commission or City Council) and was reviewed and considered by the decision-making body prior to approving the project; and (3) reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090). If the EIR is certified, the Planning Commission or City Council will make a decision in a separate action whether the proposed project will be denied, approved, or conditionally approved.

The City can approve or conditionally approve the proposed project, if it chooses, even if significant impacts are identified. When significant effects are identified and the lead agency wishes to approve or conditionally approve the project, CEQA Section 21081(a) requires that one of three specific findings be made for each significant effect. The possible findings include the following:

- ▶ Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
- ▶ Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- ▶ Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provisions of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

The City, as the lead agency, must also adopt a “statement of overriding considerations,” in accordance with CEQA Section 21081(b), if the proposed project is approved with unavoidable significant effects to the environment. The statement of overriding considerations is a statement by the decision makers acknowledging that significant unavoidable environmental impacts are acceptable when balanced against certain economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project.

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.1 Land Use			
4.1-1 Consistency with Applicable Plans. The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, no impacts associated with plan consistency would be anticipated.	NI	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	NI
4.1-2 Physically Divide an Established Community. The proposed project would not be expected to physically divide an established community. Therefore, no impact on an established community would occur with project implementation.	NI	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	NI
4.2 Traffic and Circulation			
4.2-1 Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps. The addition of project-related traffic to baseline traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the westbound ramps of the Rocklin Road/I-80 intersection during the p.m. peak hour. Because this intersection already operates unacceptably and the project's contribution would be greater than 5 percent, this impact would be considered significant.	S	Mitigation Measure 4.2-1 Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Prior to the issuance of any building permits for the project, the project applicant shall pay the City's traffic impact fee in an amount that constitutes the project's fair share contribution to the construction of improvements necessitated in part by project impacts, as reflected in a comparison between Exhibit 4.2-2 (Existing Geometrics and Traffic Control) and Exhibit 4.2-15 (Existing Plus Approved Project (Baseline) Plus Project Condition – Mitigations), consistent with the City's CIP and the SPRTA programs. 	LTS
4.2-2 Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps. The addition of project-related traffic to baseline traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the eastbound ramps of the Rocklin Road/I-80 intersection from LOS E to LOS F during the p.m. peak hour. Because this intersection already operates unacceptably and the project's contribution would be greater than 5 percent, this impact would be considered significant.	S	Mitigation Measure 4.2-2 Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Implement Mitigation Measure 4.2-1 described above in order to reduce westbound through traffic at the intersection of Rocklin Road/I-80 eastbound ramps and improve operations at this intersection to acceptable levels. 	LTS
4.2-3 Sierra College Boulevard/Rocklin Road Intersection. The addition of project-related traffic to baseline traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Sierra College Boulevard/Rocklin Road intersection during the p.m. peak hour. Because this intersection already operates unacceptably and the	S	Mitigation Measure 4.2-3 Sierra College Boulevard/Rocklin Road Intersection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The project applicant shall build an additional northbound left-turn lane (resulting in dual left-turn lanes) at this intersection. There is an approved, not-yet-built project that is obligated to 	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
project's contribution would be greater than 5 percent, this impact would be considered significant.		construct this same improvement, and if that project completes this improvement prior to the proposed project, then this project's obligation to construct the improvement is no longer necessary.	
4.2-4 Rocklin Road/Pacific Street Intersection. The addition of project-related traffic to baseline traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Rocklin Road/Pacific Street intersection during the p.m. peak hour. Although this intersection already operates unacceptably, the project's contribution would represent less than a 5 percent decrease in the volume/capacity ratio. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.2-5 Taylor Road/Horseshoe Bar Road (Loomis) Intersection. The addition of project-related traffic to baseline traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Taylor Road/Horseshoe Bar Road (Loomis) intersection during the p.m. peak hour. Although this intersection already operates unacceptably, the project's contribution would represent less than a 5 percent decrease in the volume/capacity ratio. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.2-6 Sierra College Boulevard/Taylor Road (Loomis) Intersection. The addition of project-related traffic to baseline traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Sierra College Boulevard/Taylor Road (Loomis) intersection during the p.m. peak hour from LOS C to LOS D. Based on the City of Loomis significance threshold, this impact would be considered significant.	S	Mitigation Measure 4.2-6 Sierra College Boulevard/Taylor Road Intersection (Loomis) ► Prior to the issuance of building permits for the project, the project applicant shall pay the SPRTA fee.	LTS
4.2-7 Roadway Segments. The proposed project would cause six roadway segments to exceed the threshold of daily capacity. However, in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, the traffic on all six roadway segments are forecast to operate with satisfactory volume/capacity ratios in both peak hours with project conditions. Therefore, the project's impacts on roadway segments would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.2-8 Entrance Vehicle Stacking. The project’s main access roadway has adequate length to avoid entrance vehicle stacking. Therefore, the project’s effects on entrance vehicle stacking would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.2-9 Right Turns from Unsignalized Driveway. Northbound vehicles exiting from the project’s unsignalized driveway would be required to cross two lanes of traffic. Sufficient gaps in the traffic stream would occur along Sierra College Boulevard to allow right turns from the project’s unsignalized driveway to the northbound through lanes. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.2-10 Bicycle/Pedestrian Circulation Policy Consistency. The proposed project would include design components that are intended to allow safe pedestrian/bicycle access and movement to and through the site consistent with City policies. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.3 Air Quality			
4.3-1 Short-Term Construction-Generated Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions. The short-term construction-generated emissions of PM10 would exceed PCAPCD’s significance threshold of 82 lb/day. This would be considered a significant impact.	S	Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 Short-Term Construction-Generated Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions. In accordance with the PCAPCD, the applicant shall comply with all applicable rules and regulations as discussed previously, in addition to implementation of the following recommended mitigation measures during construction of the proposed project (Backus, pers. comm., 2006b). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The applicant shall submit to the City Engineer and the PCAPCD and receive approval of a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan prior to groundbreaking. This plan must address how the project meets the minimum requirements of sections 300 and 400 of Rule 228-Fugitive Dust. ▶ The applicant shall suspend all grading operations when fugitive dust emissions exceed District Rule 228-Fugitive Dust limitations. ▶ Fugitive dust emissions shall not exceed 40% opacity and not go beyond the property boundary at any time. If lime or other drying agents are utilized to dry out wet grading areas, the project 	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>applicant shall ensure such agents are controlled as to not to exceed District Rule 228-Fugitive Dust limitations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The project applicant shall ensure that construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed Rule 202-Visible Emission limitations. ▶ The project applicant shall ensure compliance with all of PCAPCD's minimum dust requirements. ▶ Water shall be applied to control fugitive dust, as needed, to prevent impacts offsite. Operational water trucks shall be onsite to control fugitive dust. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site. ▶ PCAPCD-approved chemical soil stabilizers, vegetative mats, or other appropriate best management practices, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications, shall be applied to all-inactive construction areas (previously graded areas which remain inactive for 96 hours). ▶ Soil binders shall be spread on unpaved roads and employee/equipment parking areas, and streets shall be washed (e.g., wet broom) if silt is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares. ▶ Open burning of any kind shall be prohibited. ▶ Idling time shall be minimized to five minutes or less for all diesel-fueled equipment. ▶ ARB diesel fuel shall be used for all diesel-powered equipment. ▶ The project applicant, or the prime contractor, shall submit to the District a comprehensive inventory (i.e., make, model, year, emission rating) of all the heavy-duty off-road equipment (50 horsepower or greater) that will be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours for the construction project prior to groundbreaking. The project applicant shall provide the District with the anticipated construction timeline including start date, name, and phone number of the project manager and onsite foreman prior to groundbreaking. The project applicant shall provide a plan for approval by the District demonstrating that the heavy-duty (> 50 	

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		horsepower) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project-wide fleet-average 20 percent NOX reduction and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. Contractors can contact PCAPCD to determine if their off-road fleet meets the requirements listed in this measure.	
4.3-2 Long-Term Operational (Regional) Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions. The proposed project would increase criteria air pollutant and precursor emissions in the region above significance thresholds. Because feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce these emissions below the significance thresholds, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.	SU	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-2 Long-Term Operational (Regional) Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Emissions. The City shall require that emission control measures be incorporated into project design and operation. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The project applicant shall provide transit enhancing infrastructure that includes transit shelters, benches, street lighting, route signs and displays, and/or bus turnouts/bulbs. ▶ The project applicant shall provide bicycle enhancing infrastructure that includes secure bicycle parking. ▶ The project applicant shall provide electric maintenance equipment, use solar, low-emissions, or central water heaters, increase wall and attic insulation beyond Title 24 requirements, and orient buildings to take advantage of solar heating and natural cooling, use passive solar designs, energy efficient windows (double pane and/or Low-E), highly reflective roofing materials, cool paving (high albedo pavement) and parking lot tree shading above that required by code, install photovoltaic cells, programmable thermostats for all heating and cooling systems, awnings or other shading mechanisms for windows and walkways, utilize day lighting systems such as skylights, light shelves, interior transom windows. ▶ Parking lot design shall include clearly marked pedestrian pathways between transit facilities and building entrances included in the design. 	SU

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		▶ The project applicant shall require that all diesel engines be shut off when not in use for longer than 5 minutes on the premises to reduce idling emissions.	
4.3-3 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions. The delivery trucks associated with the proposed commercial uses have the potential to expose proposed residents (in the proposed Rocklin 60 project) along the site’s eastern boundary to elevated diesel PM emissions, which are categorized as a toxic air contaminant. However, these emission levels would not exceed established significance thresholds. Therefore, this would be considered a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.3-4 Long-Term Operational (Local) Mobile-Source Carbon Monoxide Emissions. The proposed project would increase mobile-source carbon monoxide emissions in the local area. However, this increase would not cause local mobile-source CO emissions to exceed applicable standards. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.3-5 Exposure of Sensitive Receptor to Odorous Emissions. The proposed project would introduce new odor sources into the area (e.g., trash receptacles). However, these odor sources would not be expected to adversely affect adjacent land uses. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.4 Noise			
4.4-1 Construction-Generated Temporary Increases in Ambient Noise Levels. Construction activities would result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels for existing and, potentially, for proposed residents (if approved and occupied prior to project construction) directly adjacent to the eastern site boundary. However, these construction noise levels would be intermittent and would be attenuated with the installation of the eastern perimeter wall. As a result, this impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant NI = No Impact PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.4-2 Construction Blasting Noise. If construction activities include blasting, the intermittent noise levels could be considered excessive for adjacent land uses, if the blasting activities are unexpected. As a result, this impact is considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-2 Construction Blasting Noise</p> <p>a. If blasting activities are to occur in conjunction with the improvements, the contractor shall conduct the blasting activities in compliance with state and local regulations. The contractor shall obtain a blasting permit from the City of Rocklin prior to commencing any on-site blasting activities. The permit application shall include a description of the work to be accomplished and a statement of the necessity for blasting as opposed to other methods considered including avoidance of hard rock areas and safety measures to be implemented such as blast blankets. The contractor shall coordinate any blasting activities with Police and Fire Departments to insure proper site access and traffic control, and public notification including media, nearby residents and businesses, as determined appropriate by the Rocklin Police and Fire Departments. Blasting specifications and plans shall include a schedule that outlines the time frame in which blasting will occur in order to limit noise and traffic inconvenience.</p> <p>b. Construction blasting activities shall be subject to the City of Rocklin Construction Noise Guidelines, including limiting construction-related noise generating activities within or near residential areas to the less noise sensitive daytime hours (between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, and between 8:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekends).</p>	LTS
<p>4.4-3 Traffic-Generated Permanent Increases in Ambient Noise Levels. The proposed project would not result in a noticeable increase in traffic noise levels at off-site sensitive receptors. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
<p>4.4-4 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Excessive Stationary- or Area-Source Noise Levels. The truck deliveries associated with the proposed commercial uses would generate substantial noise levels, which could affect the proposed residential uses immediately to the east of the project site. Therefore, this impact would be considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.4-4 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Excessive Stationary- or Area-Source Noise Levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The noise barrier proposed to be constructed along the site’s eastern boundary shall be constructed of masonry block, pre-cast concrete panels, or other massive materials. ▶ The height of the noise barrier along the entire eastern boundary shall be sufficient to ensure that the proposed project is consistent 	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		with City’s exterior and interior noise levels of 60 dBA Ldn and 45 dBA Ldn, respectively, for residential uses exposed to noise sources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Solid noise barriers shall extend along the cold food unloading area of the large retail/grocery store loading dock to further shield refrigeration trucks while being unloaded. Refrigeration trucks shall be required to park within those shielded loading dock areas while on the site. ▶ All rooftop mechanical equipment shall be completely screened from view of existing or proposed residences by the proposed building parapet. ▶ The noise mitigation measures shall be designed by an acoustical engineer consistent with the Noise Element’s acceptable noise levels for residential land uses. 	
4.4-5 Exposure of Sensitive Uses to Vibration Levels. The vibration levels generated by the proposed construction activities would not expose adjacent future residences to excessive vibration levels and the project’s operations would not generate any vibration sources. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.4-6 Land Use Compatibility with On-Site Noise Levels. The project would not result in exposure of sensitive land uses to noise levels in excess of the applicable land-use compatibility noise standards. In addition, the project site is not located near an airport and would not expose people to excessive aircraft-generated noise. Therefore, land use compatibility impacts associated with on-site noise levels would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.5 Population and Housing			
4.5-1 Increase in Housing Demand during Construction. Project implementation would increase construction employment within the City of Rocklin for the duration of the project’s construction activities. Because an adequate labor force is available in the local region, this temporary increase in employment would not be expected to substantially increase the	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant NI = No Impact PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
local demand for housing. This impact is considered less than significant.			
4.5-2 Increase in Housing Demand during Operations. The proposed project could directly and indirectly induce population growth in Rocklin by generating employment for approximately 800 people. However, adequate housing is available within the City and the surrounding region to accommodate this population growth. Therefore, the project's contribution to population growth and its effect on the available housing supply would be considered a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.6 Public Services and Utilities			
4.6-1 Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, and Conveyance Facilities. PCWA has sufficient water supplies to meet existing and projected future uses in addition to the proposed project's demands under all water year types (e.g., normal, single-dry, and multiple-dry years). The project site would be served by the Foothill WTP and the proposed project's estimated maximum daily water treatment demands would not exceed the plant's permitted capacity. This impact would be less than significant . However, the project would require the construction of water conveyance facilities to ensure adequate water conveyance to the site. The construction of these conveyance facilities could cause short-term environmental impacts. These short-term impacts would be considered significant .	LTS / S	Mitigation Measure 4.6-1 Increased Demand for Water Supply, Treatment, and Facilities The mitigation measures recommended in Chapter 4 of this Draft shall be applied (where applicable) to mitigate any water conveyance construction impacts, if significant, to less-than-significant levels. For example, PCAPCD measures shall be implemented to minimize fugitive dust and construction equipment emissions, and construction equipment shall be effectively muffled and limited to daytime operations. As part of any necessary encroachment permits for work within the roadway, construction traffic control plans shall be prepared and implemented in order to minimize construction traffic hazards.	LTS / LTS
4.6-2 Demand for Wastewater Treatment and Conveyance Facilities. Implementation of the project would increase the demand for wastewater treatment and conveyance facilities. Existing wastewater treatment facilities and the planned wastewater conveyance facilities currently under construction would be adequate to serve the project. This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.6-3 Increased Generation of Solid Waste. The proposed project would incrementally increase the amount of solid waste generated in the City. However, adequate long-term landfill disposal capacity is available at the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill, which would receive the solid waste generated from the project site. Therefore, the project’s impacts on solid waste disposal would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.6-4 Increased Demand for Electricity. Implementation of the proposed project would increase the demand for electricity and electrical infrastructure. The project area would be supplied with electrical services by PG&E. Electrical services are currently being provided adjacent to the project site and extension of these services to the site would not cause any physical disturbances beyond that already anticipated at the project site. For these reasons, the provision of electrical services to the project site would result in less-than-significant impacts.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.6-5 Increased Demand for Natural Gas. Implementation of the proposed project would increase the demand for natural gas. PG&E would provide natural gas to the project site through existing utility easements. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.6-6 Required Extension of Telecommunications Services. Implementation of the proposed project would require extension of existing telecommunication services. Pacific Bell and Wave Broadband Services would provide telephone and cable services, respectively, to the project site and upgrade existing facilities, as necessary, to serve the project. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant NI = No Impact PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.6-7 Increased Demand for Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services. Development of the proposed project would increase the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services. The proposed project would be required to be designed and constructed consistent with the Uniform Fire Code requirements and the project applicant would be required to pay impact fees to offset the increased demand. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.6-8 Increased Demand for Police Protection Services. Development of the proposed project would increase the demand for police protection services. The City would add personnel to the police department on an as-needed basis to meet service goals and the project includes the implementation of site security measures to minimize new demands on law enforcement. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.6-9 Increased Demand for Public School Facilities and Services. The proposed project is not expected to result in substantial population growth or new student generation. The project would be subject to development impact fees that would provide the legal maximum required level of funding under State law. The payment of school impact fees is deemed to be full and adequate mitigation under CEQA (Government Code Section 65996). As a result, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on school services and facilities.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.7 Aesthetics			
4.7-1 Impacts on Scenic Vistas. Views on or near the project site are not considered scenic vistas. Therefore, development of the project site would not alter or obscure a scenic vista. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.7-2 Damage to Scenic Resources within a State Scenic Highway. The project site is not visible from a State Scenic Highway and would not damage scenic resources. The project would result in no impacts to scenic resources within a scenic highway.	NI	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	NI

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.7-3 Changes in Visual Character. The project would convert views of an approximately 50-acre grassland/woodland landscape to urban development. Conversion from an open grassland/oak woodland landscape to urban development would substantially alter the visual character of the project area. This change would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to the visual character of the area.</p>	SU	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-3 Changes in Visual Character</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The project applicant shall comply with the requirements of the City’s design review process in order to ensure that development of the site is of a high quality and does not create visual incompatibilities. ▶ The project applicant shall submit for City review and approval a detailed site landscaping plan that softens views of the site from Interstate 80 and Sierra College Boulevard by creating a visual transition between passing vehicle traffic and the project site and minimizes the scale of the proposed commercial buildings. The landscape plan shall effectively screen parking areas, service zones, trash enclosures and mechanical equipment. The landscape plan shall also ensure that the City’s parking lot shade requirements are met. ▶ The project’s landscaping plan includes the planting of trees on the site’s eastern perimeter. This planting shall extend along the entire eastern perimeter and shall consist of a continuous row of evergreen trees. This row of trees shall have sufficient density to create a continuous visual screen between the project site and the adjacent rural residential land uses to the east (or the Rocklin 60 residential subdivision, if it is constructed in the future). The trees shall be capable of growing a sufficient height above the project’s proposed sound wall (i.e., 20- to 25-foot tall trees) to effectively screen views of the project site from the adjacent land uses. 	SU
<p>4.7-4 Impacts from Lighting and Reflective Surfaces. The project would require new lighting throughout the project site and could construct facilities with reflective surfaces that could inadvertently cause light and glare for motorists on Interstate 80 and Sierra College Boulevard, and adjacent land uses under day and nighttime conditions. In addition, the degree of darkness in the City of Rocklin and on the project site would diminish as a result of development, potentially diminishing the visibility of stars and other features of the night sky. This impact is considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.7-4 Impacts from Lighting and Reflective Surfaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ All exterior lighting fixtures shall be aimed downward and shall include shielding to prevent offsite light spillover. ▶ The project applicant shall submit a detailed lighting and photometric plan to the City as part of the design review process. This lighting plan shall ensure that proposed exterior lighting prevents unnecessary glare or reflection and that the lighting does not cause any nuisance, inconvenience, or hazard of any kind on adjoining streets or properties. 	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The project applicant shall adhere to the Rocklin Crossings General Development Guidelines and all City of Rocklin design review requirements, as applicable, regarding the appropriate use of building materials, lighting, and signage to prevent light and glare from adversely affecting motorists and adjacent land uses. 	
4.8 Public Health and Hazards			
<p>4.8-1 Exposure to Known and Unknown Hazardous Materials. No recognized environmental conditions have been identified to date on the project site. However, excavation and construction activities in the area could result in the exposure of construction workers and the general public to hazardous materials, including petroleum hydrocarbons, pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers; contaminated debris; elevated levels of chemicals that could be hazardous; or hazardous substances that could be inadvertently spilled or otherwise spread. This impact is considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 Exposure to Known and Unknown Hazardous Materials</p> <p>a. If during site preparation and construction activities previous undiscovered or unknown evidence of hazardous materials contamination is observed or suspected through either obvious or implied measures (e.g., stained or odorous soil, unknown storage tanks, etc.), construction activities shall immediately cease in the area of the find. Placer County Environmental Health Department staff shall be immediately consulted and the project applicant shall contract with a qualified consultant registered in DTSC's Registered Environmental Assessor Program to assess the situation. If necessary, risk assessments shall include a DTSC Preliminary Endangerment Assessment or no further action determination, or equivalent. Any required remediation shall include a DTSC Remedial Action Work Plan or equivalent. Based on consultation between the Registered Environmental Assessor and DTSC, remediation of the site shall be conducted consistent with all applicable regulations.</p> <p>b. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project applicant shall provide to the City of Rocklin an assessment conducted by or on behalf of PG&E pertaining to the contents of the existing pole mounted transformers located on and nearby the project site. The assessment shall determine whether the existing pole mounted transformer on the site and the pole mounted transformers adjacent to the site contain PCBs and whether there are any records of spills from such equipment. If PCB containing equipment is identified, the maintenance and/or disposal of the transformers shall be subject to the regulations of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) under the authority of the Placer</p>	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		County Environmental Health Department. If the electrical transformers are determined not to contain PCBs, they shall be labeled as such and no further mitigation shall be required.	
<p>4.8-2 Exposure to Hazardous Materials during Project Construction. Use of various paints, solvents, cements, glues, and fuels is expected during construction of the proposed project. Construction workers could be exposed to hazardous materials as a result of improper handling or use; accident; environmentally unsound disposal methods; or fire, explosion, or other emergencies, resulting in adverse health effects. However, all allowable uses would be subject to compliance with federal, state, and local hazardous materials regulations, and would be monitored by the state (e.g., Cal/OSHA, DTSC, CHP) and/or local jurisdictions. Therefore, the potential for human exposure to hazardous materials during construction would be considered a less-than-significant impact.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
<p>4.8-3 Exposure to Hazardous Materials during Project Operations. The proposed project would use many materials, some of which are considered hazardous, during the course of its daily operations. Compliance with federal, State, and local hazardous materials regulations, which would be monitored by the State and/or local jurisdictions, would reduce impacts associated with the use, transport, and storage of hazardous materials during operation of the project. Therefore, impacts related to creation of significant hazards to the public or the environment would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
<p>4.8-4 Potential for Public Health Hazards from Mosquitoes. The proposed project would include a detention basin, which could attract mosquitoes and other water-borne vectors, thereby potentially creating a public health hazard. The detention basin would be designed to not retain storm water for long periods. Therefore, it would not create a location that would facilitate mosquito breeding. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.8-5 Exposure of People or Structures to Wildland Fires. The project site is not located in a designated wildland fire area, a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, or a State Responsibility Area. In addition, the project applicant would be required to incorporate Uniform Fire Code requirements into the project designs and operations. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to significant risk of loss or injury involving wildland fires. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.9 Geology, Soils and Paleontology			
<p>4.9-1 Risks to People and Structures from Seismic Hazards. The project site is not located within an earthquake fault zone as designated by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act and no known faults are located on the project site. Based on the site topography, soil profiles, and the groundwater table, the potential for soil expansion, slope instability/failure, and liquefaction was determined to be low. However, ground shaking, as a result of seismic activity from nearby or distant earthquake faults, could cause seismic-related ground failure. Thus, development of the project site for commercial uses has the potential to expose people to adverse effects from seismic hazards, including strong seismic ground shaking. This impact would be significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-1 Risks to People and Structures from Seismic Hazards</p> <p>a. Before issuance of a grading permit, the project design plans and specifications, including grading and foundation plans, shall be reviewed by a licensed geotechnical engineer, to ensure that the recommendations in the geotechnical report have been appropriately integrated and comply with Rocklin Municipal Code Chapter 15.28, Grading and Erosion and Sedimentation Control. This review shall also assess the extent to which the recommendations in the geotechnical report are appropriate and sufficient for construction of the buildings described in the final project design plans.</p> <p>b. During project design and construction, all recommendations outlined in the geotechnical report for the project (Wallace Kuhl & Associates 2006) shall be implemented, at the direction of the City engineer, to prevent significant impacts associated with seismic activity. These recommendations specifically identify actions to be taken related to: site clearing, site preparation and engineered fill construction, final subgrade preparation, trench backfilling, foundation design, interior floor slab support and moisture penetration resistance, exterior flatwork, retaining wall design, light pole and entry sign foundations, erosion and slope winterization, surface drainage, pavement design, and geotechnical engineering observation and testing during earthwork. As identified in these recommendations, a geotechnical engineer shall be present on-site during appropriate</p>	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>earthmoving and construction activities to ensure that requirements outlined in the geotechnical report are adhered to for proper fill and compaction of soils.</p> <p>c. Should the construction schedule require continued work during the wet weather months (e.g., October through April), the project applicant shall consult with a licensed civil engineer and implement any additional recommendations provided, as conditions warrant. These recommendations would include but not be limited to (1) implementing aeration, to allow site soils to reach a proper moisture content to attain the specified degree of compaction to be achieved; and (2) implementing aeration or lime treatment, to allow any low-permeability surface clay soils intended for use as engineered fill to reach a moisture content that would permit the specified degree of compaction to be achieved (Wallace Kuhl & Associates 2006).</p>	
<p>4.9-2 Construction-Related Erosion Hazards. Excavation and grading of soil could result in localized erosion during project construction. This would be a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.9-2 Construction-Related Erosion Hazards</p> <p>a. A grading and erosion control plan shall be prepared by a California Registered Civil Engineer retained by the applicant(s) and submitted to the City of Rocklin for approval prior to issuance of grading permits. The plan shall comply with the City of Rocklin Grading and Erosion and Sedimentation Control (Municipal Code Title 15, Chapter 15.28), the erosion control recommendations in the project’s geotechnical report (Wallace Kuhl & Associates 2006), and the California Building Standards Code grading requirements. The plan shall include the site-specific grading proposed for the new development. All grading shall be balanced on the site, where feasible.</p> <p>b. To ensure grading activities do not directly or indirectly discharge sediments into surface waters as a result of construction activities, the project applicant shall develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall identify Best Management Practices that would be used to protect stormwater runoff and minimize erosion during construction.</p>	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.10 Hydrology and Water Quality			
4.10-1 Increased Runoff and Potential for Localized or Downstream Flooding. Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in impervious surfaces on the project site, which would lead to an increase in stormwater runoff compared to existing conditions. The increased surface runoff could result in a greater potential for on- and off-site flooding. The proposed project includes a stormwater runoff collection and detention system pursuant to the guidelines set forth in the Stormwater Management Manual that would reduce the post-project peak flows to pre-project levels. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.10-2 Potential for Short-Term Construction-Related Water Quality Degradation. Implementation of the proposed project could cause short-term water quality degradation associated with construction activities. Construction activities (grading, excavation, etc.) could result in substantial stormwater discharges of suspended solids and other nonpoint source pollutants, which could drain to off-site areas, potentially degrading local surface water quality. Further, areas of exposed or stockpiled soils could be subject to sheet erosion during rain events. This impact would be considered potentially significant.	PS	Mitigation Measure 4.10-2 Potential for Short-Term Construction-Related Water Quality Degradation a. The project applicant shall demonstrate compliance, through its erosion control plan and SWPPP, with all requirements of the City’s Stormwater Runoff Pollution Control Ordinance (Title 8, Chapter 8.30 of the City Code) and the Grading and Erosion and Sedimentation Control Ordinance (Title 15, Chapter 15.28 of the City Code), which regulate stormwater and prohibit non-stormwater discharges except where regulated by an NPDES permit. This includes preparing erosion, sediment, and pollution control plans for the entire construction site. The project’s grading plans shall be approved by the City of Rocklin, Engineering Department prior to the initiation of site grading activities. The project applicant shall implement measures including the use of soil stabilizers, fiber rolls, inlet filters, and gravel bags to prevent pollutants from being carried off-site in stormwater generated on the project site. These measures shall be designed to accommodate stormwater discharges associated with proposed measures that would be implemented to control on-site dust generation (e.g., wheel washing, active watering). b. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit or any construction activity, the project applicant shall obtain from the Central Valley RWQCB the appropriate regulatory approvals for project construction including a Section 401 water quality certification,	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>and an NPDES stormwater permit for general construction activity, including construction dewatering activities.</p> <p>c. As required under the NPDES stormwater permit for general construction activity, the project applicant shall prepare and submit the appropriate Notice of Intent and prepare the SWPPP and the erosion control plan for pollution prevention and control prior to initiating site construction activities. The SWPPP shall identify and specify the use of erosion sediment control BMPs, means of waste disposal, implementation of approved local plans, nonstormwater management controls, and inspection and maintenance responsibilities. The SWPPP shall also specify the pollutants that are likely to be used during construction and that could be present in stormwater drainage and nonstormwater discharges. A sampling and monitoring program shall be included in the SWPPP that meets the requirements of SWRCB Order 99-08-DWQ to ensure the BMPs are effective.</p> <p>d. Construction techniques shall be identified that would reduce the potential runoff and the SWPPP shall identify the erosion and sedimentation control measures to be implemented. The SWPPP shall also specify spill prevention and contingency measures, identify the types of materials used for equipment operation, and identify measures to prevent or clean up spills of hazardous materials used for equipment operation and hazardous waste. Emergency procedures for responding to spills shall also be identified. BMPs identified in the SWPPP shall be used in subsequent site development activities. The SWPPP shall identify personnel training requirements and procedures that would be used to ensure that workers are aware of permit requirements and proper installation and performance inspection methods for BMPs specified in the SWPPP. The SWPPP shall also identify the appropriate personnel responsible for supervisory duties related to implementation of the SWPPP. All construction contractors shall retain a copy of the approved SWPPP on the construction site.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.10-3 Potential Long-Term Degradation of Water Quality. The conversion of the site from vacant to commercial uses would introduce new stormwater pollutant sources. These pollutant sources would include oils and greases, petroleum hydrocarbons (gas and diesel fuels), nitrogen, phosphorus, and heavy metals. Pesticides, herbicides, and other landscape maintenance products typically used in landscape maintenance also could be present. These pollutants could adversely affect the site’s stormwater discharges. The potential water quality degradation associated with site operations would be considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.10-3 Potential Long-Term Degradation of Water Quality Before issuance of a grading permit for the site, the project applicant shall obtain from the Central Valley RWQCB a general NPDES permit and shall comply with all of the permit requirements in order to minimize storm water discharges associated with site operations. In addition, the project applicant shall prepare a SWPPP and implement Best Management Practices designed to minimize sedimentation and release of products used during site operations. Before approval of the final project design, the project applicant shall identify storm water runoff BMPs selected from the Storm Water Quality Task Force’s California Storm Water Best Management Practices Handbook (American Public Works Association 1993), the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association’s (1999) Start at the Source: Design Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Protection, or similar documents. Typical BMPs that could be used on the project site shall include, but are not limited to, catchbasin inserts, compost storm water filters, sand filters, vegetated filter strips, biofiltration swales, oil/water separators, bioretention basins, or other equally effective measures. Other BMPs shall include, but would not be limited to, administrative controls such as signage at inlets to prevent illicit discharges into storm drains, parking lot and other pavement area sweeping, public education, and hazardous waste management and disposal programs. BMPs shall identify and implement mechanisms for the routine maintenance, inspection, and repair of pollution control mechanisms. In addition, the BMPs shall be reviewed for adequacy by the City of Rocklin, Engineering Department prior to issuance of a grading permit for the site to ensure that they will effectively remove pollutants from the site’s stormwater runoff.</p>	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.11 Agriculture			
4.11-1 Farmland Conversion. The project would not convert important farmlands to non-agricultural land uses and would not conflict with lands zoned for agricultural uses. Therefore, no impact on agricultural resources would be anticipated with project implementation.	NI	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	NI
4.12 Biological Resources			
4.12-1 Loss of Wetlands. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the fill of jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands. This impact is considered significant.	S	Mitigation Measure 4.12-1: Loss of Wetlands. On May 16, 2007, the project applicant secured authorization for the fill of approximately 0.426 acres of jurisdictional waters of the United States (Nationwide Permit No. 39). Prior to commencing any construction activities associated with the proposed project, the project applicant shall comply with all of the terms and conditions of the Nationwide Permit. In addition, the project applicant shall obtain water quality certification pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act for the project. Any measures required as part of the issuance of water quality certification shall be implemented. If the proposed project is constructed before the proposed Rocklin 60 residential development is approved, a buffer area shall be established between the detention basin and the wetland resources to the north and east prior to the commencement of construction activities on the project site. Temporary construction fencing shall be installed around these wetland resources for the duration of construction period to ensure construction vehicles and personnel are restricted from entering the wetland areas. This mitigation will not be necessary if the proposed Rocklin 60 residential subdivision is developed prior to construction of the proposed project because the Rocklin 60 project would remove and mitigate for the loss of this wetland habitat.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.12-2 Disturbance of Common Plant and Wildlife Species. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the removal of common plant and wildlife species. These effects would not substantially reduce the habitat of any common species, cause a species to drop below self-sustaining levels, or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
<p>4.12-3 Loss of Native Oak and Heritage Trees - Short Term. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the removal of all of the native oak trees on the site, including two heritage trees. This impact would be considered significant and unavoidable in the short-term because the removed trees would not be immediately replaced with mature oak trees.</p>	SU	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.12-3: Loss of Native Oak and Heritage Trees - Short Term. Prior to any grading or construction activity, the project applicant must obtain a tree permit from the City that will include provisions for replacing lost trees and an oak tree restoration plan will be developed and implemented. This plan will provide for the replacement of as many oaks as feasible within the project area. If adequate locations cannot be found, as determined by the Development Services Manager, to replace all removed oak trees, then the remaining mitigation requirement may be met through payment into the existing City of Rocklin Tree Preservation Fund. Payments shall be calculated using the following formula: Step 1: Trunk Diameter at Breast Height (TDBH) of all Surveyed Trees on the Site X 20% = Discount Diameter Step 2: TDBH of all Surveyed Trees on the Site to be Removed - Discount Diameter = Total Number Inches of TDBH of Replacement Trees Required Such payments shall be made prior to the issuance of building permits, with review and approval by the City Engineer. The protection of oak trees not scheduled for removal must comply with pertinent sections of the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.</p>	SU
<p>4.12-4 Loss of Native Oak and Heritage Trees - Long Term. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the removal of all of the native oak trees on the site, including two heritage trees. This impact would be considered potentially significant in the long-term.</p>	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-3.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.12-5 Disturbance or Removal of Special-Status Plant Species. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss or disturbance of special-status plant species. This would be considered a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.12-6 Disturbance of Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Habitat. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the loss of elderberry shrubs, which provide potential habitat for the valley elderberry longhorn beetle. The loss of valley elderberry longhorn beetle habitat would be considered a significant impact.	S	Mitigation Measure 4.12-6: Disturbance of Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Habitat. The project applicant shall comply with the terms and conditions of the Biological Opinion issued by USFWS on March 10, 2006.	LTS
4.12-7 Disturbance of California Red-Legged Frog Habitat. Implementation of the proposed project would not be expected to adversely affect California red-legged frog due to the marginal habitat on the site and distance to known populations. Therefore, the project's potential impacts on this species would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.12-8 Disturbance of Western Pond Turtle Habitat. Implementation of the proposed project would not be expected to adversely affect western pond turtle due to the marginal habitat on the site. Therefore, the project's potential impacts on this species would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.12-9 Disturbance of Burrowing Owl Habitat. Implementation of the proposed project would not be expected to adversely affect burrowing owls because it is rare to find them nesting in the foothills as far east as the project site and there are no documented records of burrowing owls within five miles of the project area. Therefore, the project's potential impacts on this species would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
4.12-10 Disturbance of Raptors and Migratory Birds. Loss of nests of special-status species would result in substantial adverse effects to local populations. This would be considered a significant impact.	S	Mitigation Measure 4.12-10: Disturbance of Raptors and Migratory Birds. a. Removal of nesting habitat for raptors and migratory birds shall be timed to avoid the nesting season. b. If vegetation removal and/or project construction occurs during the nesting season for raptors and migratory birds,	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>preconstruction surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist approved by the City. The surveys shall cover all areas of suitable nesting habitat within 500 feet of project activity and shall be conducted within 14 days prior to commencement of project activity. The surveys shall be valid for one construction season. If no active nests are found, no further mitigation shall be required.</p> <p>c. If active nests are found, impacts shall be avoided by establishment of appropriate buffers. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that the nest is no longer active. DFG guidelines recommend implementation of 500 foot buffers, but the size of the buffer may be adjusted if a qualified biologist determines through consultation with CDFG and/or USFWS that construction activities would not be likely to adversely affect the nest. Monitoring of the nest by a qualified biologist may be required if the activity has potential to adversely affect the nest.</p>	
<p>4.12-11 Degradation of Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Trout Habitat. Project development would not be expected to directly affect Central Valley fall/late fall-run Chinook salmon or Central Valley steelhead trout. No habitat is present on the project site and the nearest habitat within Secret Ravine Creek is located approximately 300 feet to the southeast at its closest point. However, if uncontrolled, soil erosion generated during project construction and urban pollutants generated from the site during site operations could indirectly affect fish habitat by degrading the water quality within Secret Ravine Creek. Therefore, potential impacts on these species are considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.12-11: Degradation of Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Trout Habitat. Implement Mitigation Measures 4.10-2 and 4.10-3 identified in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality of this report in order to ensure water quality within Secret Ravine Creek is not substantially degraded with project construction and operation.</p>	LTS
4.13 Cultural Resources			
<p>4.13-1 Damage or Destruction of Significant Documented Cultural Resources. No significant cultural resources have been identified within or immediately adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no impacts to CRHR-listed or eligible resources.</p>	NI	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	NI

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>4.13-2 Potential Impacts to Undocumented Cultural Resources. There is the possibility that previously undiscovered and undocumented resources could be adversely affected or otherwise altered by ground disturbing activities during construction of the project. Disturbance of undocumented resources would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.13-2 Potential Impacts to Undocumented Cultural Resources. If an inadvertent discovery of cultural materials (e.g., unusual amounts of shell, charcoal, animal bone, bottle glass, ceramics, burned soil, structure/building remains) is made during project-related construction activities, ground disturbances in the area of the find shall be halted and a qualified professional archaeologist shall be notified regarding the discovery. The archaeologist shall determine whether the resource is potentially significant as per CEQA (i.e., whether it is an historical resource, a unique archaeological resource, or a unique paleontological resource) and shall develop specific measures to ensure preservation of the resource or to mitigate impacts to the resource if it cannot feasibly be preserved in light of costs, logistics, technological considerations, the location of the find, and the extent to which avoidance and/or preservation of the find is consistent or inconsistent with the design and objectives of the project. Specific measures for significant or potentially significant resources could include, but are not necessarily limited to, preservation in place, in-field documentation, archival research, subsurface testing, and excavation. The specific type of measure necessary would be determined according to evidence indicating degrees of resource integrity, spatial and temporal extent, and cultural associations, and would be developed in a manner consistent with CEQA guidelines for preserving or otherwise mitigating impacts to archaeological and cultural artifacts.</p>	LTS
<p>4.13-3 Potential to Uncover Human Remains. Subsurface disturbances associated with construction activities could potentially uncover unmarked historic-era and prehistoric Native American burials, resulting in their alteration or damage. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 4.13-3 Potential to Uncover Human Remains In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains, until compliance with the provisions of Section 15064.5 (e)(1) and (2) of the CEQA Guidelines, as well as Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, has occurred. If any human remains are discovered, all work shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and the County Coroner shall be notified, according to Section 7050.5 of the California Health and</p>	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		Safety Code. The City’s Community Development Director shall also be notified. If the remains are Native American, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which in turn will inform a most likely descendant. The descendant will then recommend to the landowner appropriate disposition of the remains and any grave goods, and the landowner shall comply with the requirements of AB 2641.	
4.14 Energy			
4.14-1 Increased Energy Demand. Project implementation would increase energy demand during both construction and operation of the proposed project. Construction and operation of the proposed buildings on the site would be required to comply with the energy efficiency standards included in Title 24 and with air quality mitigation measures identified in Section 4.3, Air Quality (Mitigation Measure 4.3-2) that would effectively reduce the project’s energy demands. Therefore, the project would not be expected to cause the inefficient, wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy. This impact is considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
5 Economic Impact and Urban Decay Analysis			
5-1 Urban Decay. Implementation of the proposed project would result in some diverted sales and some closures of primary market area stores may occur. However, these diverted sales and possible closures are unlikely to result in urban decay. This would be considered a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
6 Cumulative Impacts			
6-1 Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps Without Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the westbound ramps of the Rocklin Road/I-80 intersection during the p.m. peak hour from LOS E to LOS F. This impact would be considered significant.	S	Mitigation Measure 6-1 Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps Without Dominguez Road Implement Mitigation Measure 4.2-1.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>6-2 Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps Without Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the eastbound ramps of the Rocklin Road/I-80 intersection from LOS D to LOS E during the p.m. peak hour. This impact would be considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 6-2 Rocklin Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramps Without Dominguez Road Implement Mitigation Measure 4.2-1 in order to reduce westbound through traffic at the intersection of Rocklin Road/I-80 eastbound ramps and improve operations at this intersection to acceptable levels.</p>	LTS
<p>6-3 Barton Road/Brace Road Intersection Without Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Barton Road/Brace Road intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour. Because this intersection already operates unacceptably and the project's contribution would be greater than 5 percent, this impact would be considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 6-3 Barton Road/Brace Road Intersection Without Dominguez Road The project applicant shall pay their fair share to the signalization of this intersection. The project applicant shall pay a traffic impact fee in an amount that constitutes the project's fair share contribution to the construction of the proposed improvement as part of the City's development review process, consistent with the City's CIP program, SPRTA program, or other applicable funding program.</p>	LTS
<p>6-4 Barton Road/Rocklin Road Intersection Without Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Barton Road/Rocklin Road intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour. Because this intersection already operates unacceptably and the project's contribution would be greater than 5 percent, this impact would be considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 6-4 Barton Road/Rocklin Road Intersection Without Dominguez Road The project applicant shall pay their fair share to the signalization of this intersection. The project applicant shall pay a traffic impact fee in an amount that constitutes the project's fair share contribution to the construction of the proposed improvement as part of the City's development review process, consistent with the City's CIP program, SPRTA program, or other applicable funding program.</p>	LTS
<p>6-5 Sierra College Boulevard/English Colony Way Intersection Without Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to baseline traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Sierra College Boulevard/English Colony Way intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour and during Saturday conditions. Because this intersection already operates unacceptably and the project's contribution would be greater than 5 percent, this impact would be considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 6-5 Sierra College Boulevard/English Colony Way Intersection Without Dominguez Road The project applicant shall pay their fair share to the signalization of this intersection. The project applicant shall pay a traffic impact fee in an amount that constitutes the project's fair share contribution to the construction of the proposed improvement as part of the City's development review process, consistent with the City's CIP program, SPRTA program, or other applicable funding program.</p>	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>6-6 Taylor Road /Horseshoe Bar Road Intersection Without Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Taylor Road/Horseshoe Bar Road intersection. Although this intersection already operates unacceptably, the project’s contribution would represent less than a 5 percent decrease in the volume/capacity ratio. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
<p>6-7 Taylor Road/King Road Intersection Without Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Taylor Road/King Road intersection. Although this intersection already operates unacceptably, the project’s contribution would represent less than a 5 percent decrease in the volume/capacity ratio. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
<p>6-8 Roadway Segments Without Dominguez Road. The proposed project would cause four roadway segments to exceed the threshold of daily capacity. However, in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, the traffic on all four roadway segments are forecast to operate with satisfactory volume/capacity ratios in both peak hours with project conditions. Therefore, the project’s impacts on roadway segments would be considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
<p>6-9 Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps With Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the westbound ramps of the Rocklin Road/I-80 intersection during the p.m. peak hour from LOS E to LOS F. This impact would be considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 6-9 Rocklin Road/I-80 Westbound Ramps with Dominguez Road Implement Mitigation Measure 4.2-1.</p>	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>6-10 Dominguez Road/Granite Drive Intersection With Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Dominguez Road/Granite Drive intersection. Because this intersection already operates unacceptably and the project’s contribution would be greater than 5 percent, this impact would be considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 6-10 Dominguez Road/Granite Drive Intersection With Dominguez Road The project applicant shall pay their fair share to changing the stop control from a two-way unsignalized stop to a four-way unsignalized stop. The project applicant shall pay a traffic impact fee in an amount that constitutes the project’s fair share contribution to the construction of the proposed improvement as part of the City’s development review process, consistent with the City’s CIP program, SPRTA program, or other applicable funding program.</p>	LTS
<p>6-11 Sierra College Boulevard/Dominguez Road Intersection With Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would cause this intersection to operate unacceptably with the current roadway striping. This impact would be considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 6-11 Sierra College Boulevard/ Dominguez Road Intersection With Dominguez Road The project applicant shall pay their fair share to restriping this intersection to accommodate one exclusive left turn lane, one shared left/through lane, one exclusive through lane, and one exclusive right turn lane on the eastbound leg of Dominguez Road at the time of its construction. The project applicant shall pay a traffic impact fee in an amount that constitutes the project’s fair share contribution to the construction of the proposed improvement as part of the City’s development review process, consistent with the City’s CIP program, SPRTA program, or other applicable funding program.</p>	LTS
<p>6-12 Barton Road/Brace Road Intersection With Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Barton Road/Brace Road intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour. Because this intersection already operates unacceptably and the project’s contribution would be greater than 5 percent, this impact would be considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 6-12 Barton Road/Brace Road Intersection With Dominguez Road The project applicant shall pay their fair share to the signalization of this intersection. The project applicant shall pay a traffic impact fee in an amount that constitutes the project’s fair share contribution to the construction of the proposed improvement as part of the City’s development review process, consistent with the City’s CIP program, SPRTA program, or other applicable funding program.</p>	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant NI = No Impact PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
<p>6-13 Barton Road/Rocklin Road Intersection With Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Barton Road/Rocklin Road intersection during the a.m. peak hour. Because this intersection already operates unacceptably and the project’s contribution would be greater than 5 percent, this impact would be considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 6-13 Barton Road/Rocklin Road Intersection With Dominguez Road The project applicant shall pay their fair share to the signalization of this intersection. The project applicant shall pay a traffic impact fee in an amount that constitutes the project’s fair share contribution to the construction of the proposed improvement as part of the City’s development review process, consistent with the City’s CIP program, SPRTA program, or other applicable funding program.</p>	LTS
<p>6-14 Sierra College Boulevard/English Colony Way Intersection With Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to baseline traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Sierra College Boulevard/English Colony Way intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour and during Saturday conditions. Because this intersection already operates unacceptably and the project’s contribution would be greater than 5 percent, this impact would be considered significant.</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 6-14 Sierra College Boulevard/English Colony Way Intersection With Dominguez Road The project applicant shall pay their fair share to the signalization of this intersection. The project applicant shall pay a traffic impact fee in an amount that constitutes the project’s fair share contribution to the construction of the proposed improvement as part of the City’s development review process, consistent with the City’s CIP program, SPRTA program, or other applicable funding program.</p>	LTS
<p>6-15 Taylor Road /Horseshoe Bar Road Intersection With Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Taylor Road/Horseshoe Bar Road intersection during the weekday peak hour. Although this intersection already operates unacceptably, the project’s contribution would represent less than a 5 percent decrease in the volume/capacity ratio. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
<p>6-16 Taylor Road/King Road Intersection With Dominguez Road. The addition of project-related traffic to cumulative traffic volumes would degrade traffic operations at the Taylor Road/King Road intersection during the a.m. peak hour. Although this intersection already operates unacceptably, the project’s contribution would represent less than a 5 percent decrease in the volume/capacity ratio. Therefore, this impact would be considered less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
6-17 Roadway Segments With Dominguez Road. The proposed project would cause four roadway segments to exceed the threshold of daily capacity. However, in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, the traffic on all four roadway segments are forecast to operate with satisfactory volume/capacity ratios in both peak hours with project conditions. Therefore, the project's impacts on roadway segments would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
6-18 Interstate 80/Sierra College Boulevard Interchange. The proposed project would not degrade the Interstate 80/Sierra College Boulevard Interchange during the cumulative scenario. Therefore, the project's cumulative impacts on this interchange would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
6-19 Freeway Mainlines. The freeway mainlines would operate acceptably during the cumulative scenario with the addition of project traffic. Therefore, the project's cumulative impacts on the freeway mainlines would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
6-20 Cumulative Regional Air Quality Emissions. The project would contribute to cumulative regional air pollutant emissions. This would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact.	SU	<p>Mitigation Measure 6-20 Cumulative Regional Air Quality Emissions.</p> <p>In accordance with the PCAPCD recommendations, the applicant shall implement the following mitigation measures during construction and operation of the proposed project (Backus, pers. comm., 2006b).</p> <p>Implement Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 and 4.3-2.</p> <p>The project shall implement an offsite mitigation program, coordinated through the PCAPCD, to offset the project's long-term ozone precursor emissions. The project's offsite mitigation program must be approved by PCAPCD. The project's offsite mitigation program provides monetary incentives to sources of air pollutant emissions within the SVAB that are not required by law to reduce their emissions. Therefore, the emission reductions are real, quantifiable and implement provisions of the SIP. The offsite mitigation program reduces emissions within the SVAB that would not otherwise be eliminated.</p>	SU

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 2-1 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		In lieu of the applicant implementing their own offsite mitigation program, the applicant can choose to participate in the PCAPCD Offsite Mitigation Program by paying an equivalent amount of money into the program. The actual amount of emission reductions needed through the Offsite Mitigation Program would be calculated when the project's average daily emissions have been determined.	
6-21 Cumulative Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions. The project would contribute to localized cumulative toxic air contaminant emissions. However, because other cumulative developments in the region are not located directly adjacent to the proposed project, the combined emissions from the proposed project and other cumulative developments would not be expected to exceed established significance thresholds for sensitive receptors in the local area. This would be considered a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation measures would be necessary.	LTS
6-22 Cumulative Visual Impacts. The project would contribute to cumulative changes in the local viewshed by converting undeveloped land to urban uses. This would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact.	SU	Mitigation Measure 6-22 Cumulative Visual Impacts. Implement the mitigation measures identified in Section 4.7, Aesthetics.	SU
6-23 Cumulative Biological Resource Impacts. The project would contribute to the cumulative loss of biological resources in the region. This would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact.	SU	Mitigation Measure 6-23 Cumulative Biological Resource Impacts. Implement the mitigation measures identified in Section 4.12, Biological Resources.	SU
6-24 Cumulative Climate Change. The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions during project construction and operations. Because the proposed project would incrementally contribute to global greenhouse gas emissions, its global climate change impacts would be considered potentially cumulatively significant.	PS	Mitigation Measure 6-24 Cumulative Climate Change The project applicant shall implement the mitigation measures identified in Section 4.3, Air Quality, in order to reduce GHG emissions. These measures are summarized as follows: Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 identified in Section 4.3, Air Quality of this Draft EIR addresses short-term construction generated emissions and includes a listing of individual measures that are intended to reduce and minimize construction generated emissions. Included in the listing of the individual measures are several measures that would help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Such measures include 1) idling time for all diesel-fueled equipment shall be minimized to five minutes or less; 2) ARB	LTS

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>diesel fuel shall be used for all diesel-powered equipment, and 3) preparation of a plan for Placer County Air District approval that would demonstrate that heavy-duty off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project will achieve a project-wide fleet average 20 percent NOx reduction and a 45% particulate matter reduction compared to the most recent ARB fleet average.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.3-2 identified in Section 4.3, Air Quality of this Draft EIR addresses long-term operational generated emissions and includes a listing of individual measures that are intended to reduce and minimize operational generated emissions. Included in the listing of the individual measures are several measures that would help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Such measures may include, but are not limited to: 1) providing transit enhancing infrastructure that include transit shelters, benches, street lighting, route signs and displays, and/or bus turnouts/bulbs; 2) providing bicycle enhancing infrastructure that includes secure bicycle parking; 3) providing electric maintenance equipment, using solar, low-emissions or central water heaters, increasing wall and attic insulation beyond Title 24 requirements, orienting of buildings to take advantage of solar heating and natural cooling, using passive solar designs, energy efficient windows (double pane and/or Low-E), highly reflective roofing materials, cool paving (high albedo pavement) and parking lot shading above that required by code, installing photovoltaic cells, programmable thermostats for all heating and cooling systems, awnings or other shade mechanisms for window and walkways, and utilizing day lighting systems such as skylights, light shelves and interior transom windows; 4) including in the parking lot design clearly marked pedestrian pathways between transit facilities and building entrances, and 5) requiring all diesel engines to be shut off when not in use for longer than 5 minutes on the premises to reduce idling emissions. Furthermore, the City has determined that in addition to the project features identified in Table 6-17, the following mitigation measures would be appropriate for the proposed project and shall be required with project implementation.</p> <p>1) All dock and delivery areas shall be posted with signs informing truck drivers of the California Air Resources Board</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 2-1
Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>regulations including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Truck drivers shall turn off engines when not in use. ▶ All diesel delivery trucks servicing the project shall not idle more than five minutes, consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.3-2. ▶ Restrict idling emissions by using auxiliary power units and electrification in the docking areas if provided by the operator. <p>2) Auxiliary power shall be provided for TRUs, as feasible, at all docking facilities to minimize emissions from these units while on the project site.</p> <p>3) Implement carpool/vanpool program such as carpool ride matching for employees, assistance with vanpool formation, and provisions of vanpool vehicles.</p> <p>4) Provide preferential employee parking for carpool and vanpool vehicles.</p> <p>5) Provide transit incentives (e.g., transit subsidies for employees, implement a parking cash-out program for employees, provide transit route maps, fares, and schedules posted at the worksite in a conspicuous location [e.g., employee breakroom]).</p> <p>6) Restroom sinks within individual buildings on the site shall use sensor-activated, low-flow faucets. The low-flow faucets, because they regulate flow, reduce water usage by 84 percent, while the sensors, which regulate the amount of time the faucets flow, save approximately 20 percent in water usage over similar, manually operated systems.</p>	

LTS = Less Than Significant

NI = No Impact

PS = Potentially Significant

S = Significant

SU = Significant and Unavoidable